DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 182 RC 018 730

TITLE	Literacy and Education Needs in Public and Indian Housing Developments throughout the Nation. Report to Congress.
INSTITUTION	Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 92
NOTE	23p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *American Indians; Economically Disadvantaged; *Educational Attainment; Employment; Family Income; Literacy; *Low Income Groups; Place of Residence; *Public Housing
IDENTIFIERS	*Department of Housing and Urban Development

ABSTRACT

In response to a Senate request, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) gathered existing data on educational attainment and achievement of residents in public and Indian housing projects. Data sources included the 1989 American Housing Survey, the 1988 Survey of Income and Program Participation, the 1988 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, the 1980 census, and education-related studies of American Indians and Alaska Natives. Public housing residents had a median educational attainment of 11.4 years, compared to 12.7 years for all U.S. renters; failed to complete high school at greater than twice the rate of other renters; and graduated from college at one-sixth the rate of non-public housing residents. Minority public housing residents (Blacks and Hispanics) lagged further behind. Children in federally assisted housing had lower academic achievement on a number of measures than other U.S. youth. Moreover, parental educational attainment was strongly correlated with children's academic performance. No data source directly addressed the educational status of residents in Indian housing projects, but data on the entire Native American population showed that this group also experienced low educational outcomes. Educational attainment was correlated with employment rates and family income. This report briefly describes 10 HUD programs and activities that address the literacy and education needs of public and Indian housing residents. (SV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED348182

Literacy and Education Needs in Public and Indian Housing Developments Throughout the Nation

Report to Congress

February 1992

Re 018730

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

INTRODUCTION 2

FINDINGS 5

I. General Educational Characteristics of Public Housing Residents and American Indians/Alaska Natives . . . 5

II. Education and Income/Employment 7

III. Educational Status of Children in Federally Assisted Housing and Children of American Indians/ Alaska Natives 10

DEPARTMENTAL AND OTHER ADMINISTRATION INITIATIVES 13

I. Departmental Initiatives for Public and Indian Housing Residents 13

II. Other Departmental Initiatives 17

III. Cooperative Initiatives 17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Public housing residents are less well-educated than the U.S. population as a whole. The median educational attainment of public housing residents lags behind that of all U.S. renters by almost one and one-half years. Public housing residents fail to complete high school at more than twice the rate of other adults living in rental housing. Public housing residents graduate from college at one-sixth the rate of non-public housing residents. Minority residents of public and other federally assisted housing--blacks and Hispanics--lag further behind. These low educational attainments have discernible employment and income implications. Those with less education have lower employment rates, higher unemployment rates, a greater likelihood of being entirely out of the labor force, and, most significantly, low earnings and family incomes. The educational deficits of the parents appear to extend to their children: children of federally assisted housing residents lag behind other U.S. youth on a number of measures of academic performance. Moreover, there is a strong correlation between the academic attainment of parents and the academic performance of their children.

Because there was no data source directly addressing the educational status of residents of housing sponsored by Indian Housing Authorities, the report presents data on the entire American Indian and Alaska Native population. The data show that these groups also experience low educational attainment with its attendant consequences.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), under Secretary Jack Kemp's leadership, has initiated and broadened the development of education and literacy programs for public and Indian housing residents. These programs are integral to the Department's efforts to end poverty and promote the upward mobility of low-income families. Noting the significant correlation between the education levels of the parents and those of the children, HUD is aiming its education efforts toward intergenerational programs that involve the family unit and the entire public housing community. Moreover, because education undergirds empowerment, the Department has broadened the scope of its resident initiatives to include both academic and life-skills training. HUD is committed to continuing these efforts.

Through these initiatives, the Department participates in AMERICA 2000, President Bush's strategy to improve education for all Americans. Departmental efforts include: 1) implementing special educational enrichment programs aimed at young children, youth, and adults; 2) coordinating with other Federal agencies and private organizations to assure that public and Indian housing residents have access to education and job training resources; and 3) authorizing and encouraging public and Indian housing authorities and other local grant recipients to use HUD programs, such as the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program, for education-related activities that support the objectives of those programs.

INTRODUCTION

The Senate Committee on Appropriations in its report accompanying HUD's appropriation for 1991 requested that the Department undertake a survey of the literacy and education needs in public and Indian housing projects throughout the Nation and submit a report to Congress on this survey. This mandate was underscored by an earmark of Research and Technology funds for this purpose in the Conference Report.

Because the Department has had no historical mandate to address the education needs of residents of public, Indian, or other HUD-assisted housing, HUD neither collects nor maintains any specific information on this topic. Therefore, the Department chose to identify and use existing data sources.

After researching and assessing various data sources, HUD decided to use the American Housing Survey (AHS) data applicable to this topic, and two other sources that complement the AHS. The AHS contains information on the total population of rental households in the U.S. and on the total population of public housing residents. It contains only a few education-related data elements, which will provide a brief overview of the educational attainment of public housing residents. The report uses 1989 data, the last year for which data for this kind of analysis is available.

To complement the limited AHS data, HUD has selected two additional sources that provide richer perspectives on this subject: the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) and the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY). These two sources, while covering the more inclusive population of residents of all federally assisted housing, provide further insight on the dimensions and implications of the low educational performance and achievement of the public housing population.

SIPP is an annual survey of 14,000 households conducted by the Census Bureau to provide information on the economic situation of American households, including participation in Federal benefit programs. Each year the Census Bureau selects a predominantly new sample for the survey; results are representative of the U.S. population. This report has used data from the 1988 survey, the last year for which data are publicly available.

NLSY is a national probability survey sponsored by the Department of Labor which obtains data on the annual labor force experience of a specific group of individuals, namely, young men and women who were between the ages of 14 and 21 in 1979, the year the survey began. The same sample is interviewed annually. The data from the NLSY are representative for this segment of the U.S. population. This report has used data from 1988, the most recent year for which data are publicly available. Because respondents were ages 23 to 30 in 1988, the results of the NLSY apply to this group.

As noted above, a limitation of these two data sources is that respondents are not

identified specifically as residents of public housing, but as residents of federally assisted housing. However, the data from these two sources appear to be consistent with the AHS data because comparable measures of educational attainment are similar. Specifically, the median educational attainment for public housing householders in the AHS data is 11.4 years, while the median educational attainment for federally assisted householders in the SIPP data is 11 years. Similar comparisons can be made for specific sub-groups that can be identified in each of the two sources.[1] However, while income and other eligibility requirements for public housing and other HUD-assisted housing programs--such as the Section 8 programs-- are comparable, the AHS shows that public housing residents differ somewhat from other HUD-assisted residents on several attributes, including education. Specifically, while all HUD-assisted housing residents are less well-educated than the total U.S. rental population, public housing residents are more educationally disadvantaged than residents of other HUD-assisted housing programs.[2] This suggests that the NLSY and SIPP data, which cover all residents of federally assisted housing, may somewhat overstate the educational attainment of residents of public housing.

Responding to the request of Congress for information on education needs of residents of housing sponsored by Indian Housing Authorities (IHAs) has been a more difficult challenge. Unable to identify any data source directly addressing the educational status of residents of IHA housing, HUD has decided to rely on data from various sources, including the 1980 census and other education-related studies on American Indians and Alaska Natives. These data typically refer to the total American Indian and Alaska Native population (hereafter referred to as American Indians/Alaska Natives).[3]

American Indians living on reservations and on Oklahoma Tribal Jurisdiction Lands, and Alaska Natives living in Alaska Native Villages are somewhat more disadvantaged on

---

[1]The respective educational attainment medians,in years, for these sub-groups from AHS/SIPP are as follows: blacks--11.7/11; Hispanics--10.4/10; and elderly--9.0/9. One reason for the slightly lower medians for the SIPP data may be that these medians have been computed as whole numbers, rather than as fractions.

[2]According to the AHS, the median educational attainment is 12.2 years for Section 8 Certificate/Voucher holders, and 12.3 years for residents of private, project-based housing.

[3]1990 census information on the social and economic characteristics of American Indians/Alaska Natives is not yet available, and is not scheduled to be released until late 1992. However, total population counts are available. The 1990 census enumerated nearly two million American Indians/Alaska Natives, compared with nearly 1.5 million in 1980. This population is distributed in the following way: (1) American Indians/Alaska Natives living away from reservations and from Alaska Native Villages--1,273,844; 2) American Indians living on reservations and Trust Lands--437,357; 3) American Indians living on Oklahoma Tribal Jurisdiction Lands--200,789; and 4) Alaska Natives living in Alaska Native Villages--47,244.

various socio-economic indicators, including educational attainment, than the total American Indian/Alaska Native population. The latter, however, is more disadvantaged on these indicators than the total U.S. population.[4] There is, then, a general similarity between the total American Indian/Alaska Native population and those residing on reservations, on Oklahoma Tribal Jurisdiction Lands, and in Alaska Native Villages. Households residing in HUD-assisted IHA housing constitute almost 50 percent of all households--approximately 80,000 out of 175,404--residing on reservations and Trust Lands, on Oklahoma Tribal Jurisdiction Lands, and in Alaska Native Villages.[5]

This report will present data on the entire American Indian/ Alaska Native population, rather than specific data on residents of IHA housing. The data for all American Indians/Alaska Natives probably overstate the socio-economic condition of IHA residents but highlight basic patterns and trends. While the characteristics of residents of IHA housing should be somewhat similar to those of residents of reservations, Oklahoma Tribal Jurisdiction Lands, and Alaska Native Villages, HUD cannot yet make a definitive statement about this relationship, because the appropriate quantitative data are not currently available.[6]

One further comment is in order. The results of this analysis show that the educational attainment of public housing residents is low. This analysis reinforces and confirms what the Department has learned while implementing various housing and community development programs. How HUD has responded to the education needs of public housing residents and residents of other HUD-assisted housing programs is the subject of the final section of this report.

---

[4]The 1980 census reports that the high school graduation rate for all American Indians/Alaska Natives is 56 percent, while the graduation rate for residents of reservations, Oklahoma Tribal Jurisdiction Lands, and Alaska Native Villages is 43 percent. The total American Indian/Alaska Native population--including American Indians on reservations and Oklahoma Tribal Jurisdiction Lands and Alaska Natives in Alaska Native Villages-- lags behind the total U.S. population in median household income, rate of poverty, and labor force participation, according to the 1980 census.

[5]Approximately 80,000 HUD-assisted IHA housing units have been produced under all HUD programs as of January 1992. There are 175,404 households living in these three areas, as enumerated in the 1990 census.

[6]The most expeditious and cost-effective way of making this determination would be to compare data from HUD's Multifamily Tenant Characteristics System (MTCS) with 1990 census data when the latter become available.

FINDINGS

I. General Educational Characteristics of Public Housing Residents and American Indians/Alaska Natives

Data from the AHS show that public housing residents are less educated than the U.S. rental household population as a whole. According to the AHS data, the median educational attainment for public housing residents is 11.4 years, while the median for the total rental population is 12.7 years, a gap of 1.3 years. The NLSY survey, which covers the 23-30 age group of residents of federally assisted housing, reports similar educational outcomes: 12.0 years for federally assisted housing residents and 13.1 years for the rest of the U.S. population. The educational attainment of American Indians/Alaska Natives also is low: the median education is 10 years (Department of Education study, 1981).

The gap in educational attainment between public housing residents and the total rental household population is brought into clearer focus by examining Table 1. It shows that (1) the rate at which public housing residents do not complete high school is over twice that of all rental households, (2) public housing residents attend college at less than 40 percent the rate of residents of rental housing as a whole, and (3) public housing residents are less than one-sixth as likely as the total rental population to have graduated from college.

Table 1: Highest Grade Achieved for Public Housing Residents and Total Rental Household Population [AHS]

Residential Status	Highest Grade Achieved			
	11 Years or Less	High School Graduate	Some College	College Graduate
Public Housing Residents	56%	29%	12%	3%
Total Rental Households	25%	36%	19%	20%

For American Indians/Alaska Natives, educational outcomes are also poor: 44 percent of adult American Indians/Alaska Natives did not complete high school, and American Indians/Alaska Natives graduate from college at only 40 percent of the rate of all other Americans (1980 Census). Another poignant indicator of low educational achievement is the high school dropout rate: among American Indian/Alaska Native teens who were high school sophomores in 1980, the proportion who did not complete high school was 29 percent, which

was twice the national rate for all sophomores (1980 National Longitudinal Survey, U.S. Department of Education, 1982).

AHS data suggest that educational attainment varies inversely by age: the median educational attainment for elderly (65+) public housing residents is 9 years, while the overall median for public housing residents is, as noted earlier, 11.4 years. SIPP data (Table 2) show this relationship in more detail for the federally assisted housing population. These data show that 1) those under age 45 have a discernibly higher educational attainment than those over 45, and 2) for every age category, assisted housing residents have a discernibly lower educational attainment than the general population.[7]

Table 2: Mean Educational Attainment of the Federally Assisted Housing Population vs. the Non-Assisted Population, by Age [SIPP]

Age	Mean Educational Attainment		
	Assisted Housing Resident (Years)	Non-Assisted Housing Resident (Years)	Educational Attainment Differentials (Years)
Under 30	11.8	13.2	-1.4
31-45	11.7	13.1	-1.4
46-60	9.6	11.7	-2.1
Over 60	8.8	10.5	-1.7

Within the overall federally assisted housing population (SIPP), the data indicate that educational attainment varies by race and ethnicity. Whites living in assisted housing have a mean educational attainment one-half year higher than the overall mean for all assisted housing residents. Blacks, on the other hand, fall just below the overall mean attainment, while Hispanics fall below the mean by over one year. The educational outcomes for the younger assisted housing population (NLSY) show a similar pattern: whites are slightly above the mean, blacks fall slightly below, while Hispanics fall almost one year below the overall mean for this population.

[7]Data from SIPP and NLSY from this point forward will be reported in the form of means, rather than medians. While means are typically higher than medians when there are no upper bounds, the same patterns and relationships exist.

Both SIPP and NLSY indicate little variation between men and women. For all assisted housing residents (SIPP),the mean educational outcomes for men and women are identical: 10.4 years. For the younger population (NLSY), the mean educational attainment is 12.1 years for males and 11.9 years for females.

II. Education and Income/Employment

As would be expected, educational attainment has a clear relationship to economic status. SIPP and NLSY data reveal that educational attainment has definite income and employment implications. While the overall levels of income are low, family income varies directly with the educational level of the adult householders. This is true for the total federally assisted housing population (SIPP) and for the younger federally assisted housing population (NLSY). As educational achievement rises, so does income (Table 3).

Table 3: Mean Family Income of Federally Assisted Housing Residents, by Educational Attainment [SIPP/NLSY]

Highest Grade Completed (Years)	Mean Family Income	
	SIPP	NLSY
0-11	$6,000	$7,700
12	$7,700	$10,600
13-15	$9,700	$16,200
16-20	$15,800	$27,700

A similar pattern exists for American Indians/Alaska Natives (Table 4).

Table 4: Mean Annual Earnings of American Indians/Alaska Natives, by Educational Attainment [1980 Census]

Highest Grade Completed (Years)	Mean Annual Earnings	
	Males	Females
0-11	$10,400	$5,600
12	$12,500	$7,200
13-15	$13,800	$8,100
16-20	$18,200	$10,400

Another way to understand the relationship between federally assisted housing residents' economic well-being and their level of education is to look at the way education affects employment status. For the overall assisted housing population (SIPP), a positive relationship exists between employment and educational attainment; i.e., those who are employed have higher educational attainments than those who are unemployed or not in the labor force (Table 5).

Table 5: Mean Educational Attainment of Federally Assisted Housing Residents, by Employment Status [SIPP]

Employment Status	Mean Education (Years)
Employed	11.6
Unemployed	11.1
Not in Labor Force	9.4

For the younger assisted housing population, employment status is also clearly linked to education: better-educated residents are more likely to be employed, less likely to be unemployed, and less likely to be out of the labor force (Table 6).

Table 6: Employment Status of Federally Assisted Housing Residents, by Education [NLSY]

Highest Grade Completed (Years)	Employment Status		
	Employed	Unemployed	Not in Labor Force
0-11	33%	15%	52%
12	52%	11%	37%
13-15	58%	10%	32%
16-20	57%	3%	40%

Moreover, for the younger population, there is a strong correlation between family income and the employment status of the adult householder. Those who are employed have higher incomes than those who are either unemployed or not in the labor force (Table 7).[8]

Table 7: Mean Family Income and Education of Federally Assisted Housing Residents, by Employment Status [NLSY]

Employment Status	Mean Family Income	Mean Education (Years)
Employed	$16,700	12.0
Unemployed	$9,600	11.4
Not in Labor Force	$11,600	11.3

Another dimension of this issue is the relationship between education and welfare recipiency, i.e., receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children and/or food stamps. For the younger population, federally assisted housing residents with less education generally are

[8]The mean family income for those not in the labor force is somewhat higher than the income for those who are unemployed. While this result might appear to be an anomaly, it may be explained in large measure by the fact that the respondent in the NLSY survey may have a spouse who is employed. The basic point to note is that the respondent has no earned income to contribute to family income.

more likely to receive welfare than those with more education.[9] In fact, three-fifths of all such residents with less than a high school education are welfare recipients (Table 8).

Table 8: Rate of Welfare Recipiency Among Federally Assisted Housing Residents, by Highest Grade Completed [NLSY]

Highest Grade Completed (Years)	Rate of Welfare Recipiency
0-11	60%
12	27%
13-15	52%
16-20	10%

In sum, the above data show the economic consequences of low educational attainment: low employment rates, high unemployment rates, a great likelihood of being out of the labor force entirely, high welfare recipiency rates, and most significantly, low earnings and family income.

III. Educational Status of Children in Federally Assisted Housing and Children of American Indians/Alaska Natives

The educational attainment of parents carries over to their children. For the younger federally assisted housing population (NLSY data), a series of four widely used and accepted cognitive development and academic achievement tests were administered to the children of female respondents in the survey.[10] Performance on these tests is highly predictive of later and overall academic performance and educational attainment, and the results show a consistent pattern. Children in assisted housing lag behind other children by at least 10 points on all four achievement tests. Moreover, minority children--blacks and Hispanics--

---

[9]This relationship holds true, but at much lower magnitudes, for the non-federally assisted part of the younger population. Also, Table 8 shows that the rate of welfare recipiency for those with some college (13-15 years) is twice as great as the rate for those with only a high school degree. This might be explained by the fact that the cohort with some college is relatively small.

[10]These tests include the PIAT (Peabody Individual Achievement Test) Math, PIAT Reading Recognition, PIAT Reading Comprehension, and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. Because they were administered to children of varying ages, the test results were normed by age before the percentile scores were determined.

perform more poorly than non-minority children (Table 9 and Table 10).

Table 9: Performance on Academic Achievement Tests (Mean Percentile Score), by Residential Status [NLSY]

Residential Status of Children	Academic Achievement Tests			
	PIAT Math	PIAT Reading Recognition	PIAT Reading Comprehension	Peabody Picture
Federally-Assisted Housing Children	40	48	48	20
Other Children	50	58	57	38

Table 10: Performance on Academic Achievement Tests (Mean Percentile Score) of Residents of Federally Assisted Housing, by Ethnicity [NLSY]

Ethnicity of Children	Academic Achievement Tests			
	PIAT Math	PIAT Reading Recognition	PIAT Reading Comprehension	Peabody Picture
Black	34	44	42	13
Hispanic	33	42	48	9
White/Other	52	58	61	32

On all four measures of academic achievement, a child's test performance varies directly with the educational attainment of the mother. That is, the educational attainment of the parent appears to carry over to the child. Children of parents not completing high school fare most poorly, while children of college graduates fare the best on all the measures of academic achievement (Table 11).

Table 11: Federally Assisted Housing Children's Academic Test Performance (Mean Percentile Score), by Educational Attainment of Mother [NLSY]

Mother's Highest Grade Completed (Years)	Achievement Test Scores of Children			
	PIAT Math	PIAT Reading Recognition	PIAT Reading Comprehension	Peabody Picture
9-11	41	38	33	15
12	52	54	39	19
13-15	55	56	44	18
16-20	61	61	57	37

Information on high-school dropout rates from SIPP reinforce the finding of lagging educational performance. For teens 14 to 16 years old, assisted housing youth are twice as likely as other youth--9.2 percent to 4.3 percent--to have dropped out of school. Among teen dropouts in assisted housing, males drop out twice as frequently as females--16.5 percent to 7 percent. Similar to the achievement test results, the dropout phenomenon highly correlates with parental educational levels: children of parents with a high school degree or less have significantly higher dropout rates than children of parents who have attended college.[11] The overall educational level of adults in assisted housing is low, as noted.

Key indicators of educational performance of children of American Indians/Alaska Natives, although based on different measures, show a comparable pattern of low educational performance and bleak outlook. In 1988, the proportion of American Indian/Alaska Native eighth graders 1) scoring below basic proficiency in both reading and mathematics was twice the national rate; 2) repeating at least one grade was 50 percent higher than the national rate; and 3) experiencing two factors placing them "educationally at risk" was one-third higher than the national rate (National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS) of 1988).[12] Further, children of American Indians/Alaska Natives have a high school dropout rate that exceeds the national rate by over 20 percent (National Center for Educational Statistics, Drop-out Rates in the United States, 1988).

In sum, youth living in assisted housing and American Indian/Alaska Native youth lag

---

[11]For the SIPP data, the teen dropout rate for children whose parents attended college was zero.

[12]Risk factors included in the Department of Education's definition are single-parent family, low parent education, limited English proficiency, low family income, sibling dropout, and home alone more than 3 hours on weekdays.

noticeably behind other U.S. youth in educational attainment and performance. Such educational disadvantage is closely related to the educational disadvantage of the children's parents.

DEPARTMENTAL AND OTHER ADMINISTRATION INITIATIVES

While the Department has no historical mandate to address the education needs of public and Indian housing residents, Secretary Kemp is vitally aware of the importance of education. Under the Secretary's leadership, HUD is committed to using all available public and private resources to fight poverty, empower the poor, encourage upward mobility, and provide homeownership and entrepreneurial opportunities. At his direction, the Department initiated and broadened the development of education and literacy programs for residents of public and Indian housing. Efforts cover the educational spectrum from pre-school initiatives to efforts to provide greater access to college and university training.

Realizing the vital role education plays in promoting individual empowerment and thus helping to break the insidious cycle of poverty, HUD is supporting and encouraging PHAs, IHAs, and resident groups to multiply their efforts to provide education opportunities for public and Indian housing residents. Because of the importance of family in successful educational attainment, HUD is promoting many efforts to strengthen and benefit the nuclear family. In this vein, HUD is expanding its efforts to promote intergenerational academic programs for families living in public and Indian housing communities through better utilization of current resources and more creative collaboration with both public and private agencies. This is being done through such programs as Public Housing Drug Elimination, Public Housing Youth Sports, and Family Self-Sufficiency.

An integral part of the Department's strategy is to enter into cooperative initiatives with other Federal agencies and private organizations in order to combine HUD's resources and expertise with theirs. To demonstrate HUD's commitment, the Department has added an education specialist to help coordinate these efforts. To date, HUD has established joint initiatives with several Federal agencies in support of public and Indian housing residents' education needs and expects to continue the and implement new ones. The Department has successfully mobilized the support of several private organizations for these initiatives.

The Department also addresses the education and literacy needs of families receiving assistance under other HUD programs. These efforts are not discussed in this report.

I. Departmental Initiatives for Public and Indian Housing Residents

The following HUD programs, in various ways, address the literacy and education needs of public and Indian housing residents:

HOPE Homeownership Grants Program--The Administration's Homeownership and

Opportunity for People Everywhere (HOPE) grants program empowers low-income families to become homeowners by providing planning and implementation grants to organizations that will help them buy their homes and achieve economic independence. Planning grants may be used for a wide range of activities that will help develop the capacity to implement a viable homeownership plan. Implementation grants may be used for property acquisition, rehabilitation, operating expenses and reserves, training, and other purposes. Education is an integral feature of the HOPE strategy for helping families achieve homeownership and self-sufficiency. Under all three HOPE grant programs, grants may be used for: training and counseling resident managers and homebuyers; activities that promote self-suficiency, including job training and education; and economic development efforts such as training homebuyers to establish small businesses. Grantees may use up to $250,000 of their grant funds on self-sufficiency and economic development activities. In FY 1992 a total of $351 million is available for the following HOPE programs enacted in the National Affordable Housing Act: Public and Indian Housing Homeownership (HOPE 1), Multifamily Homeownership (HOPE 2), and Single Family Homeownership (HOPE 3). Also, HUD is planning workshops and developing guidebooks that will help grant recipients implement effective HOPE programs.

Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program--The FSS program is also one of the HOPE empowerment intitiatives. Through incentive awards of Section 8 rental certificates and rental vouchers, and public and Indian housing development assistance, the Family Self-Sufficiency program encourages public and Indian housing authorities to coordinate needed services such as child care, education, and job training to help families achieve economic independence. PHAs and IHAs may consult with their local Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS), and other public and private agencies when designing their programs. PHAs and IHAs will compete for a share of the incentive award funds. Approximately 29,000 Section 8 and 1300 public and Indian housing incentive units will be made available from FY 1991 and/or FY 1992 appropriations. In FY 1993, the FSS program becomes mandatory for all PHAs and IHAs receiving new allocations of public and Indian housing units or Section 8 rental assistance. HUD is working with the Departments of Health and Human Services (HHS), Education, and Labor to assure their cooperation. Also, HUD is planning workshops and developing a guidebook that will help PHAs and IHAs and their coordinating committees leverage public and private resources to implement sound FSS programs.

An early Secretarial initiative that served as a building block for the FSS program was Operation Bootstrap. Under Operation Bootstrap and its predecessor, the Project Self-Sufficiency demonstration, HUD provided Section 8 rental vouchers and rental certificates as incentives to encourage PHAs and IHAs to coordinate education, job training, and other public- and private-sector services to help families become economically self-sufficient.

Resident Management Technical Assistance--HUD competitively awards training and technical assistance grants to public and Indian housing resident groups for resident management. Grants of up to $100,000 fund activities to set up resident management

entities; develop their housing and property management capabilities; develop financial management, business, and organizational development skills; design educational and social support programs; start small businesses; and secure community support for resident management. In Fiscal Years 1988 through 1991, the Department awarded $12.4 million to 195 resident organizations. In FY 1992, HUD will make $5 million available for this program.

Public Housing Drug Elimination Program--In Fiscal Years 1989, 1990, and 1991, HUD awarded, respectively, $8.2 million, $97.4 million, and $140.7 million to PHAs and IHAs across the country to reduce and eliminate drug-related crime in their communities. A major focus of local efforts under this program has been education-related activities for public housing residents, with special emphasis on families and youth. These education-related activities are embodied in prevention efforts, which constituted more than 45 percent of the funds awarded in FY 1991. Such activities include not only drug education efforts but programs focusing on scholastic activities in cooperation with local school systems. Thus the Department's anti-drug efforts will contribute not only to make public housing communities drug free, but to keep the Nation's schools free of drugs and violence, thereby giving public housing youth a chance to improve their scholastic performance. Additionally, HUD offers free technical assistance and anti-drug resource information to public and Indian housing authorities and residents, particularly on prevention and educational strategies. HUD is working with other Federal agencies to target resources toward public and Indian housing.

Public Housing Youth Sports Program Grants--The Youth Sports Program (YSP) is based on the principle that organized sports activities are an integral part of the educational development of youth and can encourage them to stay in school and remain drug-free. Authorized by the National Affordable Housing Act, the YSP will award 5 percent of the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program appropriation to qualified entities to carry out youth sports programs in public and Indian housing developments with substantial drug problems. The maximum grant amount is $125,000. The combined FY 1991-92 competition will award $15.75 million to support athletic, cultural, art, educational, and leadership activities as alternatives to drugs and gangs. After the award of these grants the Spring of 1992, HUD will conduct a national youth sports convention for grantees to discuss ways to link the YSP to educational and entrepreneurial activities for young people. A forerunner of this program, with the same name, provided $2.4 million to 100 grantees in FY 1989 for sports, recreational, and cultural activities for at-risk youth in public and Indian housing communities.

Self-Employment Grants--The Department has awarded 13 grants totalling $2 million to Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) entitlement communities, PHAs, and private organizations to provide training and technical assistance to public housing residents to help them start and operate their own small businesses.

Public Housing Comprehensive Transition Demonstration --This demonstration, authorized by the 1987 Housing and Community Development Act, is being carried out in

Charlotte, North Carolina, by the Charlotte Housing Authority. The goal of the demonstration is to move families out of public housing and off public assistance into private-sector housing and economic independence by removing economic disincentives to personal initiative and industry. The demonstration, known in Charlotte as the Gateway Transitional Housing Demonstration, establishes incentives to encourage participating families to save funds, and prohibits reductions in benefits received from certain Federal programs as the result of increased family earnings. Under the demonstration, a variety of support services, including education, job training and career counseling, are made available to participating families to help them achieve economic independence. Participating families are expected to complete the transition out of public housing within 7 years. The intention is to have up to 100 families enrolled in the program at any one time. The demonstration has been in operation since late 1988.

Public Housing Mixed-Income New Communities Strategy Demonstration--HUD has issued a Notice of Funds Availability to solicit the participation of eligible PHAs in this demonstration, which is authorized by the National Affordable Housing Act. The demonstration's purpose is to revitalize troubled urban communities through the provision of public housing in socio-economically mixed settings, combined with the innovative use of public housing operating subsidies to stimulate the development of new, affordable housing in such communities. Participating PHAs will be expected to coordinate services, including remedial education, education for completing high school, job training, and financial counseling, to help participating families achieve economic independence and move into private rental housing or homeownership.

Dwelling Units Used for Education Activities--PHAs that use dwelling units to support economic self-sufficiency services may submit a request for a waiver of Performance Funding System (PFS) regulations so that operating subsidy eligibility will continue for those units removed from the dwelling rental inventory. Such services might include learning centers, tutoring arrangements, college course offerings, computer classes, and other education or training activities. Pending publication of a final regulation, the procedures for requesting such a waiver and the basis for receiving a waiver can be found in Notice 90-39 (PHA) issued August 24, 1990.

Assisted Housing Policies in Support of Adult Literacy--Assisted housing policies for both the Low Rent Public Housing program and the Section 8 Existing Housing program (rental certificates and vouchers) support adult literacy to promote economic independence. For example, the Department's definition of income fosters participation in educational and vocational activities. Specifically, in determining eligibility and rent in assisted housing programs, PHAs are required to exclude: 1) scholarships, to the extent they are made available to cover the cost of tuition, fees, books, equipment, materials, supplies, transportation, and miscellaneous personal expenses; 2) amounts received under training programs funded in whole or in part by the Job Training Partnership Act; 3) amounts received under training programs funded by HUD; and 4) amounts received by participants in publicly assisted programs for reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses. In addition,

participants are allowed to deduct from income the child care expenses necessary to enable a family member to further his or her education.

II. Other Departmental Initiatives

Other HUD programs and initiatives, with a focus broader than the public housing community, also address the education and literacy needs of public and Indian housing residents. They include:

Community Development Block Grant Program--Under the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program up to 15 percent of the funds may be used for public services, including child care and literacy-related services. For entitlement communities in FY 1988, the most recent year for which data is available, $12 million was used for child care and $8 million was spent on job training. A portion of these funds may serve public housing residents.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities--These institutions participate in two separate programs. The Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) Technical Assistance Program, funded for the last time at $1.5 million in FY 1991, has enabled these institutions to help local governments utilize their CDBG funds more effectively. They provided assistance to local governments on a broad range of issues, including training for resident management, housing rehabilitation, preschool programs, and the development of educational activities and program operations that emphasize economic development and business entrepreneurship. The new HBCU Community Development program, first authorized for FY 1991, is intended to expand the entrepreneurial and economic development efforts of HBCUs. In FY 1991, $4.5 million was awarded to 10 of the institutions. They will work with local governments to promote economic growth and community development and to combat longstanding poverty problems such as homelessness. A portion of these funds may serve public and Indian housing residents.

Community Development Work Study Program--This program makes grants to States, councils of governments, or institutions of higher education to help economically disadvantaged and minority students participate in a work study program while enrolled in full-time graduate or undergraduate programs in community development or related fields. Grants are used to pay tuition and living expenses of participating students. For Fiscal Years 1989 through 1991, $9.3 million has been awarded to 71 colleges and universities to assist 357 economically disadvantaged students.

III. Cooperative Initiatives

The Office of Public and Indian Housing, in collaboration with other parts of the Department, has taken a leadership role with other Federal agencies and private organizations to meet the literacy and education needs of public and Indian housing residents in the following ways:

Early Childhood Development Grants--Pursuant to the interagency agreement to integrate resources to empower low-income families, HUD and HHS in October 1991 announced the award of $4.8 million of HUD's FY 1990 Early Childhood Development funds to 22 Head Start organizations serving public and Indian housing communities. The grants will provide full-day child development services for young public and Indian housing residents and will enable their parents or guardians to seek, retain, or train for employment or pursue educational goals. Because of Head Start's positive impact on the educational development of low-income children, HUD is in the process of transfering $9.9 million of its 1991 and 1992 Early Childhood Development funds to continue this joint initiative. In Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989, HUD awarded $10 million to grantees for child care services for public and Indian housing residents under the Public Housing Child Care Demonstration program, the forerunner to the current program.

Economic Empowerment Initiative--Under an interagency agreement, HUD and HHS in October 1991 announced the funding of 13 Economic Empowerment Partnerships to encourage self- sufficiency through job training, child care, resident management, and homeownership in public housing communities. This initiative will allow HUD's empowerment efforts to be better integrated with the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program. A major focus of this initiative is to encourage upward mobility by improving the education, literacy, and work skills of public housing residents. The partnerships will receive a total of $2 million in Community Development Block Grant technical assistance funds, human assistance waivers, and exemptions to facilitate on-site delivery of services, including job training and child care.

Gateway Grants--As part of the Education Act of 1991, States are authorized and encouraged to award Adult Literacy Grants competitively to public and Indian housing authorities for literacy programs and related activities that meet the needs of the residents. Such grants are to be known as Gateway Grants. HUD is working closely with the Department of Education and with public and Indian housing authorities to assure that they have the maximum opportunity to apply for and receive these funds.

Partnership with Kraft General Foods and the U.S. Department of Agriculture--In 1990, HUD began a joint initiative with Kraft General Foods' consumer education programs in public housing communities to help residents develop practical living skills and move toward economic self-sufficiency. The effort is currently being field tested in eight locations nationwide: Los Angeles, Houston, Philadelphia, New York City, Decatur (GA), Tampa, Chicago, and Washington, D.C. The partnership combines the substantial financial and human resources of Kraft General Foods and the urban education and curriculum development experience of the land grant universities that participate in USDA's Cooperative Extension Service/4-H program. Each of the eight participating public housing developments received $25,000 in USDA funds to offset the cost of such activities as counseling and training in health nutrition, consumer education, employability, youth clubs and activities, communications, personal coping, leadership development, and volunteerism. Public housing residents are expected to enhance their literacy and mathematical skills

through curricula that are culturally relevant and practical for daily purchasing decisions.

The I Have a Dream Program--The Department is working with Eugene Lang and his I Have a Dream Foundation to set up I Have a Dream programs in public housing developments in New York and Chicago. More than 250 children are expected to participate in these communities. Local efforts provide tutoring and mentoring support for participating students, and local corporate and community sponsors will pay the college tuition of participating students who successfully complete high school. Current plans call for expansion to Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and Trenton, New Jersey.

Youth Initiatives Summit--In February 1992, HUD and HHS jointly convened the Youth Initiatives Summit. The purpose of the Summit was to discuss ways to channel the energies of public housing youth into constructive and productive activities and enterprises. The Summit focused on six themes: security, health, education, families, youth sports/recreation, and job skills and opportunities. The conference identified grassroots success stories, including the principles followed by successful youth and their families; discussed the initiatives of several Federal agencies to leverage resources supporting public housing youth empowerment and anti-violence; and formulated a coordinated effort to enlist public housing youth and their parents in addressing critical community issues. Participants, in addition to the youth, law enforcement, public housing, and grassroots leaders from 12 cities nationwide, included representives of the major domestic Cabinet agencies and the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

White House Conference on Indian Education--The Department actively cooperated with the White House working group responsible for this conference, authorized by the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 and held on January 22-24, 1992 in Washington, D.C. A report summarizing the proceedings and presenting recommendations to improve educational programs for American Indians/Alaska Natives will be issued in May 1992.

National Network of Colleges and Universities--The Department is in the early stages of organizing a network of colleges and universities that will work with PHAs, resident management corporations, and resident organizations. These institutions will be expected to provide or find resources to promote all forms of resident initiatives, such as resident management, homeownership, self-sufficiency education and training, small business development, and child and youth development.

Overarching all of the Department's educational initiatives is AMERICA 2000, President Bush's strategy to improve education for all Americans. The above initiatives support the President's national education goals, which include: 1) assuring that all children in America will start school ready to learn; 2) increasing the high school graduation rate to at least 90 percent for all Americans; 3) achieving literacy for all adult Americans, to enable them to compete in the global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship; and 4) making all schools in America free of drugs and violence, allowing them

to offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

To demonstrate the Department's active support for, and participation, in AMERICA 2000, Secretary Kemp, together with four other Cabinet members, took part in the inauguration of the State of Nebraska's AMERICA 2000 efforts in September 1991. To further the implementation of AMERICA 2000, the Department is actively encouraging public housing residents, resident management corporations, resident councils, and public and Indian housing authorities to participate in their respective State and local AMERICA 2000 committees.